



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,730	02/13/2002	Randal J. Ramig	13768.243.1	8871

47973 7590 05/19/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/074,730

Applicant(s)

RAMIG, RANDAL J.

Examiner

Chirag R. Patel

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2002.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12, 17-22, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aziz et al. (US 6,119,234).

As per claim 1, Aziz et al. discloses in a requesting computer system that is network connectable to a network, the requesting computer system including a native host name resolver that is not capable of resolving a host name when the requesting computer system is connected to the network, a method for resolving a host name, comprising the following:

an act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system; (Col 8 lines 13-17, Col 8 lines 20-21, Figure 2B item 250)

an act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol; (Col 10 lines 42-60, Figure 2B item 225)

and an act of rerouting the host name data to a module that may resolve the host name data (Col 6 lines 64-67, Col 7 lines 6-7)

As per claim 2, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of utilizing a loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 29-35)

As per claim 3, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the act of utilizing a loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of utilizing a defined IP loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 13-17)

As per claim 4, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of assigning the requesting computer system as the primary name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 66-67, Col 9 lines 1-4)

As per claim 5, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of assigning the requesting computer

Art Unit: 2141

system as a DNS server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 66-67, Col 9 lines 1-5, Col 6 lines 23-25)

As per claim 6, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol comprises the following: an act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system that is associated with an IP network; (Col 10 lines 42-60, Col 5 lines 61-64, Col 8 lines 14-15) IP addresses are inherent to the internet.

As per claim 7, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 6, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system that is associated with an IP network comprises the following: an act of monitoring port 53 of the requesting computer system; Port 53 is inherent to the DNS system because it is the default DNS port. (Col 10 lines 42-60, Col 5 lines 61-64, Col 8 lines 14-15)

As per claim 8, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol comprises the following: an act of monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol that is compatible with an IP network. (Col 10 lines 42-60, Col 5 lines 61-64, Col 8 lines 14-15) IP addresses are inherent to the internet.

As per claim 9, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 8, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol that is compatible with an IP network comprises the following: act of monitoring a name resolution port for host name data contained in one or more UDP packets; UDP is inherent to the TCP/IP protocol stack which is used for the Internet in accordance with the particular configuration. (Col 5 lines 3-4)

As per claim 10, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol comprises the following: an act of a replacement host name resolver monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host name data sent from a native host name resolver. (Col 8 lines 29-30, Figure 2B item 226)

As per claim 11, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving host name data in a host name resolution protocol comprises the following: an act of a resolving computer system monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host name data sent from a native host name resolver. (Col 7 lines 4-6, Col 8 lines 20-25, Figure 2B item 225)

Art Unit: 2141

As per claim 12, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of rerouting the host name data to a module that may resolve the host name data comprises the following: an act of a replacement host name resolver rerouting the host name data to a module that may resolve the host name data. (Col 8 lines 36-38)

As per claim 17, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of rerouting the host name data to a module that may resolve the host name data comprises the following: an act of a replacement host name resolver rerouting the host name data to a module that was identified by entering one or more parameters in a user interface; The interface allows one to enter the parameters. (Col 2 lines 64-67, Col 8 lines 36-38)

As per claim 18, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: an act of providing the requesting computer system with a network address by resolving the host name data that was rerouted. (Col 11 lines 55-57, Figure 4A item 435)

As per claim 19, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 18, wherein the act of providing the requesting computer system with a network address by resolving the host name data that was rerouted comprises the following: providing the requesting computer system with a numerical IP address by resolving a domain name

Art Unit: 2141

that was rerouted; Providing a numerical IP address is inherent to the process for DNS.

(Col 1 lines 18-20)

As per claims 20 and 26, please see claim 1 as they are directed to the same subject matter.

As per claim 21, Aziz et al. discloses a method as recited in claim 20, wherein the step for receiving host name data from the requesting computer system so as to make host data available to other modules comprises the following: an act of a replacement host name resolver receiving host name data that originated at a native host name resolver included in the requesting computer system. (Figure 2 item 226, Figure 2 item 250)

As per claim 22, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 20, wherein the step for receiving host name data from the requesting computer system so as to make host data available to other modules comprises the following: an act of a resolving computer system receiving host name data that originated at a native host name resolver included in the requesting computer system. (Figure 2 item 225, Figure 2 item 250)

As per claim 24, please see claims 1 and 18 as they are directed to the same subject matter.

As per claim 27, Aziz et al. discloses the computer program product as recited claim 26, wherein the one or more computer-readable media include physical storage media. (Col 10 lines 13-17)

As per claim 28, Aziz et al. discloses the computer program product as recited claim 26, wherein the one or more computer-readable media include system memory. (Col 10 lines 13-17)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-14, 16, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz et al. (US 6,119,234) in view of Tan et al. (US 6,314,469).

As per claim 13, Aziz et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 1, however, fails to disclose an act of modifying the host name data so that the host name data is compatible with the module that may resolve the host name data. Tan et al. discloses wherein the act of rerouting the host name data to a module that may resolve the host name data comprises the following: an act of modifying the host name data so that the

Art Unit: 2141

host name data is compatible with the module that may resolve the host name data. (Col 9 lines 53-63, Figure 1 item 16). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the host name data to be compatible with the module that may resolve the host name data because it allows businesses to communicate to each other internationally across different systems and languages. (Col 9 lines 39-42)

As per claim 14, Aziz et al. / Tan et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 13, however Aziz et al. fails to disclose an act of modifying the protocol used to transport the host name data. Aziz et al. discloses wherein the act of modifying the host name data so that the host name data is compatible with the module that may resolve the host name data the comprises the following, an act of modifying the protocol used to transport the host name data. (Col 9 lines 55-67, Col 10 lines 1-2) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the protocol used to transport the host data name in the disclosure of Aziz et al. because it allows the client to client the packet over the internet to the destination. (Col 10 lines 6-7)

As per claim 16, Aziz et al. / Tan et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 13. Aziz et al. discloses wherein the act of modifying the host name data so that the host name data is compatible with the module that may resolve the host name data the comprises the following: an act of modifying the format of host name data that is

Art Unit: 2141

incompatible with secure DNS so that the host name data be resolved in accordance with secure DNS. (Col 5 lines 60-63, Col 6 lines 23-40)

As per claims 23 and 25, please see claim 13 as they are directed to the same subject matter.

Claims 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz et al. (US 6,119,234) / Tan et al. (US 6,314,469) further in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition, Copyright 2002)

As per claim 15, Aziz et al. / Tan et al. discloses the method as recited in claim 14, and Aziz et al. fails to disclose modifying the protocol used to transport the host name data from UDP to TCP. Tan et al. discloses wherein the act modifying the protocol used to transport the host name data of comprises the following: an act of modifying the protocol used to transport the host name data from UDP to TCP. (Col 5 lines 40-47) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to convert udp to tcp in the disclosure of Aziz et al. because it allows for reliable error free delivery (Microsoft Computer Dictionary pg. 513)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McGarvey (US 5,777,989) discloses a TCP/IP host name

Art Unit: 2141

resolution for machines on several domains. Alkhatib (US 6,119,171) discloses a domain name Router that uses domain names to route data sent to a destination on a network. Stanback, Jr. et al. (US 6,449,657) discloses an internet hosting system that provides multiple domain requests. Mwikalo et al. (US 6,480,508) discloses a router-based domain name system proxy agent using address translation. Foti et al. (US 2002/0027915) discloses a system and method for address resolution in internet protocol (IP) – based networks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER